

पहिलहि सेँ मोहि दुग दुग रह्य, 'from the first, have I had this fear,' 6, 21.

ऊ,—लागल सबडक मुँह पनिद्या, 'the mouths of all began to water, 5, 2.

ऊँ,—हरिऊँक आँखि आफल भरि नोर, 'the eyes of Hari became filled with tears', 9, 52.

अगनऊँ सेँ बहरायि, 'he goes out from the courtyard,' 3, 2.

*Note on the preceding Essay.*—By A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE, PH. D.

The great difficulty which one still too commonly meets in the comparative study of the Gaudian languages, with regard to the derivation of their inflectional forms, is the want of continuity in the descent of the latter. We know them in their modern Gaudian stage, and in their ancient Prákrit stage; but very often the intermediate links are unknown. These would have to be looked for in the popular literature of the period intermediate between Gaudian and Prákrit; that is, about 700 to 1000 years ago. I say, the *popular* literature, because the Gaudians are not descended from the Literary Prákrits, but from the vernacular (Apabhramśa) forms of Prákrit. Of such popular literature, if it existed, very little has survived, or, at least, is known to have survived. One of the oldest specimens is the Hindí Epic of Chand, the *Prithiráj Rásau*, which is about 700 years old. Moreover, this as well as nearly all of the older popular literature known to us is in verse, while, for the particular question of derivation, prose literature would be far more useful.

Besides such fragments of survived popular literature, some help is afforded by those portions of the later Prákrit grammars which treat of the Apabhramśa Prákrit, and in which their authors have embodied many comparatively modern forms, current in their own time, mixed up with much older forms known to them traditionally. This remark applies, for example, to the grammar of Hemachandra, who lived about 750 years ago.

Whenever the intermediate links are wanting, it is both natural and right to bridge the gap by the help of conjecture, and it is nothing surprising, that conjecture sometimes takes differing lines and arrives at different results. There are, however, instances of forms, of which the series of links of descent is almost, if not entirely, complete; and it may be hoped, that gradually, as our knowledge extends, their number will increase.

One such instance occurs among the forms referred to in the preceding Essay. This is the form ending in ऐँ, ऐँ or ऐ, ए and occurring in such words as पाके or पीके "behind" or "afterwards", जैसे-तैसे "as-so," etc. These forms

may end in *ai*, or *e*, with or without a nasal; thus पाइ or पाइे, पाइै or पाइैँ. The nasalised and unnasalised forms are equally common; but the forms in ए or ए are modern and in present use, while those in ऐ or ऐँ are older. The latter are still met with in the Rámáyan side by side with the more modern forms. Examples of both may be seen on pages 122, 123. In the much older Hindí of Chand's *Prithiráj Rásau*, only the forms in ऐ or ऐँ occur; both, with or without nasal, being used promiscuously. But by the side of them, a still older form in अइ or अइँ is occasionally met with.

Thus; ऐ in

इकं इक पच्चै बियं जंन जोरं । “the men walked in pairs, one (pair) behind the other,” XXXV, 18.

मुनि हाडलि हंमीर हत्य जोरै अप अगै । “Hahuli Hammír, hearing it, joined his hands before the king,” XXXV, 16.

सकल भूमि कौ भेद राज जानै ए भगै । “the king knows the whole condition of the land in this part (of the country)” XXXV, 17.

ता पहिले पायान जोध रन असुरन कडिय । “before that (*i. e.* sunrise) the warriors mounted and issued forth to the battle-field against the enemies,” XXXIV, 32.

Again ऐँ in

मानें कि रास मज्जैँ गुपाल । “just like Gopál in the midst of his sport,” XXXV, 25.

दीय कगद लिपि अगैँ । “he gave (him) a letter, which he had written before,” XXXIV, 21.

पच्चैँ ही भज्जिये होइ दुज्जनां हसाई । “if ever you flee back, it will be the laughing-stock of the enemies,” XXXIII, 19.

रविवार सुरंग सु सत्तमैँ गुन प्रमान जंबुअ पुल्यौ । “on a Sunday, the seventh (of the month), by means of a mine, cleverly laid, the fort of Jambu was breached;” XXXV, 21.

श्रीयकाज श्रीराम सु हल हनमंतह तैसैँ । स्वामि काज सामंत बियौ धर संभव जैसैँ ॥

“The Sámantas in the service of their lord entered into the enemy's country exactly in the same artful way as Hanumán did in the glorious service of Ráma,” XXXV, 21.

असवार ऐसैँ सनाहंत कइं । मनो बीय सौकी पियं भाग वइं ॥ “The armoured horsemen were so cut to pieces, as a husband's fortune is scattered by (his taking to himself) a second wife,” XXXII, 62.\*

Again अइँ

occurs in the last quoted instance, where one manuscript has preserved the old form जैसइँ.

There is good reason to believe that these older forms in अइ, for ऐ, were much more frequent in the Epic as originally composed by Chand. For

\* The printed edition has ऐसैँ, which is a misprint.

occasionally, where the MSS. now read ऐ, the metre requires अइ, thus showing that the form ऐ is a later one, due to subsequent copyists.\*

Now turning to Hema Chandra, we find that the usual form in the Apabramśa Prākṛit is अइ, while by the side of it occasionally अइँ and अइँँ occur.†

Thus: अइ in

एहउँ वढु चिंतंतहं पच्छइ होइ विहाणु । “for thee, O fool, who think thus, it becomes at last morning;” IV, 362, 420.

तो हउँ जानउँ एऊ हरि जइ मऊ अगइ ब्रौप्यि । “hence I know (that) it is Hari when he speaks before me,” IV, 391.

पिअ जौअँतिहे मुहकमलु एम्वइ सुरउ समत्तु । “when I see the lotus-face of my beloved, then my pleasure is complete,” IV, 332, 420.

Again अइँ in

पइँ विणु धवल न चडइ भरु एम्वइँ वुन्नउँ काइँ । “without thee, beloved, the load does not fall, why then art thou grieved?” IV, 421, 423.

Again अइँँ in

एम्वइँँ राह पओहरहँ ञं भावइ तं होउ । “now let what may happen to the breasts of Rádhá,” IV, 420.

जामइँँ विमसी कज्जगइ जीवहँ मज्जे एइ । तामइँँ अच्छउ इअरु जणु सुअणु विअंतर देइ ॥

“As long as there is this perverse mode of business among men, so long let the evil man engage in it, but the good keeps aloof,” IV, 406.

Here एम्वइ, एम्वइँ and एम्वइँँ are evidently equivalent forms, an inflection of the pronominal base एम्व, corresponding to जेम्व, तेम्व (see H. C. IV, 401, 418). In Chand this inflection occurs in the modified form अम्वै or अम्वैँ “then,” “now.”

\* There is a similar case. The termination of the third pers. sing. present in Hindí is now ए; the older form is ऐ, and a still older form is अइ. The latter occasionally occurs in Chand; e. g., मुकइ न गिडि पच्छै अजूह, “the flock of vultures does not cease (following) behind,” XXXV, 22. Similarly रुडइ “he is angry,” नडइ “it is spoilt,” in XXXV, 25. In XXVI, 52 थानथान नर उडै “men fly up in different places,” we have उडै, for उडइ as the metre requires, which shows that Chand must have written उडइ. The form in अइ is Prākṛit.

† In the examples quoted from Hemachandra, I have substituted the *anunásika* ( ° ) in several places for the *anusvára* which appears in the printed edition of Prof. Pischel, who follows herein the MSS. That the former is correct, is shown by the metre, which is the well-known *dohá* in all those examples. Prosodically the difference between the two sounds is great, the *anusvára* making the preceding vowel *long by position*, while the *anunásika* has no such effect. In *writing* Natives are apt to overlook this difference, but never in *pronunciation*.—In the second example (from IV, 391) the printed edition (and MSS.) has एहो which, as the metre shows, should be एऊ (cf. H. C. IV, 362).—In the sixth example (from IV, 406) एइ does not represent the Skr. एति “it goes,” as Trivikrama’s commentary erroneously translates, but the Skr. एषा (nom. sing. fem. of एतद्) “that” (see H. C. IV, 363); it qualifies कज्जगइ.

Similarly जामहिँ—तामहिँ “so long-as,” “when-then,” are inflections of the pronominal bases जाम, ताम, which, with the same meaning, are met with, both in the Ap. Prák. and in Chand, e. g.,

जाम न निवडइ कुम्भयडि सीहचवेडचडक्क । ताम स मचहँ मयगलहँ पइ पइ वज्जइ ढक्क ॥ “so long as the cracking blow of a lion’s paw does not fall on their broad forehead, that noise of the mad, furious elephants resounds,” H. C. IV, 406.

हंकरै सिंह कौदह ति बाम । उत्तरै देवि दाहिन सु ताम ॥ “a lion roared on their left side, then Devi descended on the right (side),” *Prithiráj Rásau*, XXXV, 22.

Both this and the preceding set of pronominal bases correspond to the Sanskrit द्यत्, यावत्, तावत्.

Now this evidence shows that the Gaudian termination ँ, ए, etc., cannot be identified with the Sanskrit instrumental termination एन, but that it is to be traced back to the Apabhramśa Prákrit ending अहि or अहिँ.

There is another circumstance, making for the same conclusion, which is worth noting. There is good reason to believe that the Sanskrit termination एन, whenever it was employed in the later vernaculars (which happened occasionally) was always felt to be a tatsama and preserved nearly intact. The vowel ए was, sometimes, shortened, but the final न was not changed into a mere nasalisation of ए. In Chand the Sanskrit instrumental in एन occurs but very rarely, and always unchanged; thus,

इह सार सुइ मिट्टिय डरेन । जानियै त्रिय वयसंधि तेन ॥ “In this battle success was missed through their cowardice; thereby you may know (that they behaved like) young women,” XXXIII, 30.

In Bangálí the forms हेन *hēna* “so,” केन *kēna* “why,” केन ना *kēn’na* “because,” जेन *jēna* “as if” are still in use (see Shama Churn Sircar’s Bg. Gr., pp. 217, 218, 237, 238); here *ē* is short, but *na* is intact. Perhaps the commoner Bangálí forms जेसन *jēsan* “as,” तेसन *tēsan* “so,” केसन *kēsan* “how” (*ibid.*, p. 216) may be similarly explained as instrumentals of the Apabhramśa pronominal bases जेम्, तेम्, केम् (above noticed), the old ending एन being shortened to अण, but again keeping the final न intact. In Maithilí, also, occur जेना *jenā* “as,” तेना *tenā* “so,” (see Grierson’s Mth. Gr. Part I, p. 109, in Extra No. of J. A. S. B., 1880),\* where the final long आ is merely the Maithilí way of indicating a short open *ā* as distinct from अ, which latter is pronounced something like *āw*.

There remains the question to what inflectional case the Apabhramśa Prákrit terminations अहि or अहिँ belong. Now Hemachandra (IV, 357) expressly ascribes the suffix हिँ to the locative sing. of masc. and neut. bases in *a*, and also (IV, 347) to the loc. plur. of all bases, whether ending in *a* or *i* or *u*. He further ascribes (IV, 341, 352) the suffix हि to the loc. sing. of all bases in *i* and *u*, and to fem. bases in *a*. We have therefore Hema-

\* Maithilí जेँ, तेँ are, I think, contractions of the Ap. Pr. जहिँ, तहिँ (H. C. IV, 357).

chandra's express authority for looking on the termination अहिं as indicating the loc. sing. ; and since the suffix हि (as a locative suffix) is in all probability a mere variety of the suffix हिं, we may assume that, even though not noticed by Hemachandra, it might also be used with bases in *a*, just as with bases in *i* and *u*.\* However that may be, it is certain that in after times both suffixes हिं and हि were used as terminations of the locative singular. This is proved both by the usage of Tulsí Dás in his Rámáyan and of the Maithilí, as already stated in the preceding Essay, pp. 126, 130. If modern pandits maintain that the suffix हिं is always used by Tulsí Dás in a plural sense, they can only do by saying that when it is used in the singular it conveys an honorific sense. But this is merely an easy method of theirs of squaring awkward facts with a pre-conceived theory. *Pace* the pandits, we must judge for ourselves ; for instance, taking the example, quoted on p. 123, there is no conceivable reason why अनरितुहिं "not in season," should have a plural sense, whether honorific or otherwise, standing as it does by the side of the singular रितु "in season". Many other examples, of similar undeniable singulars, might be cited.

It may be added that in the examples quoted above (p. 160) from Chand the words भग्नै "in this part," सप्तम "on the seventh day," and many other similar instances, cannot well be explained as anything else than locatives.

However, I am not absolutely concerned to prove that every single modern form in ए or ए corresponds to an Ap. Prák. locative. It is certain that a later period, the affixes हिं and हि were used in a much looser way, as a sort of general inflectional suffix (as may be seen from the examples, cited on pp. 122—125), and it is, therefore, quite permissible to say, that the modern termination एँ is used in the sense of the instrumental in certain cases (*viz.*, in the regular declension of the Maithilí, see Grierson's Mth. Gr. Part I, p. 9). This does not apply, however, to phrases like पाछेँ, आगेँ, etc., which can be directly traced to the Ap. Pr. and shown to be locatives. But in any case, by whatever particular case-name they may be called, the modern forms in एँ, ए are direct descendants of Ap. Pr. forms in अहिं, अहि.

I will only add, in conclusion, that I am inclined to agree with the theory put forward on pp. 154ff regarding the probable derivation of the verbal noun in *a* or *i*, obl. *ai* or *e*, though I should carry up the descent of the oblique forms to the Ap. Pr. terminations in हि and ऊ rather than to the literary Pr. termination in ईए. Thus, the obl. देखे and देखे (p. 151) correspond to the oblique घरव and घरै (see p. 151), and I would identify the South Maithilí and Mágadhí oblique घर० (pronounced *gharāw* with *āw* as in the English "law") with Ap. Pr. घरऊ, while the Mágadhí obl. वरै is the same as Ap. Pr. घरहि. I hope to have another opportunity of further explaining this view.

\* Indeed, as H. C. gives both forms एम्बद (= एम्बहि) and एम्बइं (= एम्बहि) promiscuously, he virtually allows the unnasalised suffix हि to *a*-bases.